



## STATE OF WISCONSIN Division of Hearings and Appeals

---

In the Matter of

Office of the Inspector General, Petitioner

vs.

DECISION

Case #: FOF - 160649

██████████ Respondent

---

The issue for determination is whether the respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation (IPV).

There appeared at that time the following persons:

**PARTIES IN INTEREST:**

Petitioner:

Office of the Inspector General  
Department of Health Services - OIG  
PO Box 309  
Madison, WI 53701

Respondent:

██████████  
██████████  
████████████████████

█

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:**

Debra Bursinger  
Division of Hearings and Appeals

### **FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. The respondent (CARES # ██████████) is a resident of Milwaukee County who received FS benefits in Milwaukee County from January 13, 2014 through September 23, 2014.
2. On June 6, the respondent posted the following on Twitter: "Anyone in the Milwaukee area want to buy food stamps inbox me."
3. On September 23, 2014, the petitioner prepared an Administrative Disqualification Hearing Notice alleging that respondent attempted to traffick FS benefits.

4. The respondent failed to appear for the scheduled November 6, 2014 Intentional Program Violation (IPV) hearing and did not provide any good cause for said failure to appear.

### **DISCUSSION**

An intentional program violation of the FoodShare program occurs when a recipient intentionally does the following:

1. makes a false or misleading statement, or misrepresents, conceals or withholds facts;  
or
2. commits any act that constitutes a violation of the Food Stamp Act, the Food Stamp Program Regulations, or any Wisconsin statute for the purpose of using, presenting, transferring, acquiring, receiving, possessing or trafficking of FoodShare benefits or QUEST cards.

*FoodShare Wisconsin Handbook*, § 3.14.1; *see also* 7 C.F.R. § 273.16(c) and Wis. Stat. §§ 946.92(2).

An intentional program violation can be proven by a court order, a diversion agreement entered into with the local district attorney, a waiver of a right to a hearing, or an administrative disqualification hearing, *FoodShare Wisconsin Handbook*, § 3.14.1. The petitioner can disqualify only the individual found to have committed the intentional violation; it cannot disqualify the entire household. Those disqualified on grounds involving the improper transfer of FS benefits are ineligible to participate in the FoodShare program for one year for the first violation, two years for the second violation, and permanently for the third violation. Although other family members cannot be disqualified, their monthly allotments will be reduced unless they agree to make restitution within 30 days of the date that the FS program mails a written demand letter. 7 C.F.R. § 273.16(b).

7 C.F.R. §273.16(e)(4) provides that the hearing shall proceed if the respondent cannot be located or fails to appear without good cause. The respondent did not appear or claim a good cause reason for not attending the hearing. Therefore, I must determine whether the respondent committed an IPV based solely on the evidence that the petitioner presented at hearing.

In order for the petitioner to establish that an FS recipient has committed an IPV, it has the burden to prove two separate elements by clear and convincing evidence. The recipient must have: 1) committed; and 2) intended to commit a program violation per 7 C.F.R. § 273.16(e)(6). In *Kuehn v. Kuehn*, 11 Wis.2d 15 (1959), the court held that:

Defined in terms of quantity of proof, reasonable certitude or reasonable certainty in ordinary civil cases may be attained by or be based on a mere or fair preponderance of the evidence. Such certainty need not necessarily exclude the probability that the contrary conclusion may be true. In fraud cases it has been stated the preponderance of the evidence should be clear and satisfactory to indicate or sustain a greater degree of certitude. Such degree of certitude has also been defined as being produced by clear, satisfactory, and convincing evidence. Such evidence, however, need not eliminate a reasonable doubt that the alternative or opposite conclusion may be true. ...

*Kuehn*, 11 Wis.2d at 26.

*Wisconsin Jury Instruction – Civil 205* is also instructive. It provides:

Clear, satisfactory and convincing evidence is evidence which when weighed against that opposed to it clearly has more convincing power. It is evidence which satisfies and convinces you that “yes” should be the answer because of its greater weight and clear convincing power. “Reasonable certainty” means that you are persuaded based upon a rational consideration of the evidence. Absolute certainty is not required, but a guess is not enough to meet the burden of proof. This burden of proof is known as the “middle burden.” The evidence required to meet this

burden of proof must be more convincing than merely the greater weight of the credible evidence but may be less than beyond a reasonable doubt.

Further, the *McCormick* treatise states that “it has been persuasively suggested that [the clear and convincing evidence standard of proof] could be more simply and intelligibly translated to the jury if they were instructed that they must be persuaded that the truth of the contention is highly probable.” 2 *McCormick on Evidence* § 340 (John W. Strong gen. ed., 4<sup>th</sup> ed. 1992).

Thus, in order to find that an IPV was committed, the trier of fact must derive from the evidence, a firm conviction as to the existence of each of the two elements even though there may exist a reasonable doubt that the opposite is true.

In order to prove the second element, i.e., intention, there must be clear and convincing evidence that the FS recipient intended to commit the IPV. The question of intent is generally one to be determined by the trier of fact. *State v. Lossman*, 118 Wis.2d 526 (1984). There is a general rule that a person is presumed to know and intend the probable and natural consequences of his or her own voluntary words or acts. See, *John F. Jelke Co. v. Beck*, 208 Wis. 650 (1932); 31A C.J.S. Evidence §131. Intention is a subjective state of mind to be determined upon all the facts. *Lecus v. American Mut. Ins. Co. of Boston*, 81 Wis.2d 183 (1977). Thus, there must be clear and convincing evidence that the FS recipient knew that the act or omission was a violation of the FS Program but committed the violation anyway.

This case deals with an allegation of trafficking. Under 7 CFR §271.2, trafficking means:

- (1) The buying, selling, stealing, or otherwise effecting an exchange of SNAP benefits issued and accessed via Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) cards, card numbers and personal identification numbers (PINs), or by manual voucher and signature, for cash or consideration other than eligible food, either directly, indirectly, in complicity or collusion with others, or acting alone;
- (2) The exchange of firearms, ammunition, explosives, or controlled substances, as defined in section 802 of title 21, United States Code, for SNAP benefits;
- (3) Purchasing a product with SNAP benefits that has a container requiring a return deposit with the intent of obtaining cash by discarding the product and returning the container for the deposit amount, intentionally discarding the product, and intentionally returning the container for the deposit amount;
- (4) Purchasing a product with SNAP benefits with the intent of obtaining cash or consideration other than eligible food by reselling the product, and subsequently intentionally reselling the product purchased with SNAP benefits in exchange for cash or consideration other than eligible food; or
- (5) Intentionally purchasing products originally purchased with SNAP benefits in exchange for cash or consideration other than eligible food.
- (6) Attempting to buy, sell, steal, or otherwise affect an exchange of SNAP benefits issued and accessed via Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) cards, card numbers and personal identification numbers (PINs), or by manual voucher and signatures, for cash or consideration other than eligible food, either directly, indirectly, in complicity or collusion with others, or acting alone.

This definition became effective November 19, 2013.<sup>1</sup> The previous definition of trafficking did not include attempted trafficking in (6).

The Federal Registrar, addressing the amendment to the trafficking definition, indicates that “attempt” consists of the “intent to do an act, an overt action beyond mere preparation, and the failure to complete the act.”<sup>2</sup>

The OIG argues that there is clear and convincing evidence that the respondent committed an intentional program violation when she attempted to sell FS on Twitter in violation of the federal regulations.

The agency presented a copy of the June 6 Twitter post as evidence. The post does not contain a year in the date. I note, however, that the agency presented evidence demonstrating that the respondent did not become eligible for FS benefits until January, 2014. Therefore, I conclude the posting must have been on June 6, 2014. The regulation prohibiting attempts to traffick benefits became effective November 19, 2013.

The Twitter post was on the account of “[REDACTED]” The agency presented evidence that the Facebook account of the respondent is linked to the Twitter account of [REDACTED]. The Twitter account has a picture of the account holder attached. The respondent contacted the agency in September, 2014 after she had received the agency materials notifying her of the finding of an intentional program violation. She initially denied that she was the Twitter account holder. When the agency explained that it had linked the account to her facebook account, she indicated that it was an old Twitter account that must have been hacked. The agency requested additional information from the respondent including a photo and other information about the hacked account. The respondent did not provide any additional information.

I conclude there is sufficient evidence to find that the respondent had formed an intent to purchase FS benefits and took overt action to complete that act. Specifically, the Twitter post demonstrates that she had formed a clear intent to sell her benefits. In addition, the acts of going onto the computer, signing in to her Twitter account, creating a post and posting are overt actions beyond mere preparation to commit the act of attempting to sell FS benefits.

Based upon the record before me, I find that the petitioner has established by clear and convincing evidence that the respondent intentionally violated FS program rules, and that this violation was the first such violation committed by the respondent. Therefore, the petitioner correctly seeks to disqualify the respondent from the FS program for one year.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

1. The respondent violated, and intended to violate, the FS program rule specifying that the attempt to buy or sell FS benefits is prohibited.
2. The violation specified in Conclusion of Law No. 1 is the first such violation committed by the respondent.

**NOW, THEREFORE, it is**

**ORDERED**

That the petitioner’s determination is sustained, and that the petitioner may make a finding that the respondent committed a first IPV of the FoodShare program and disqualify the respondent from the program for one year, effective the first month following the date of receipt of this decision.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.federalregister.gov/articles/2013/08/21/2013-20245/supplemental-nutrition-assistance-program-trafficking-controls-and-fraud-investigations>

<sup>2</sup> See <https://www.federalregister.gov/articles/2013/08/21/2013-20245/supplemental-nutrition-assistance-program-trafficking-controls-and-fraud-investigations#h-13>

## REQUEST FOR A REHEARING ON GROUNDS OF GOOD CAUSE FOR FAILURE TO APPEAR

In instances where the good cause for failure to appear is based upon a showing of non-receipt of the hearing notice, the respondent has 30 days after the date of the written notice of the hearing decision to claim good cause for failure to appear. See 7 C.F.R. sec. 273.16(e)(4). Such a claim should be made in writing to the Division of Hearings and Appeals, P.O. Box 7875, Madison, WI 53707-7875.

## APPEAL TO COURT

You may also appeal this decision to Circuit Court in the county where you live. Appeals must be filed with the Court **and** served either personally or by certified mail on the Secretary of the Department of Health Services, 1 West Wilson Street, Room 651, Madison, WI 53703, **and** on those identified in this decision as “PARTIES IN INTEREST” **no more than 30 days after the date of this decision** or 30 days after a denial of a timely rehearing request (if you request one).

The process for Circuit Court Appeals may be found at Wis. Stat. §§ 227.52 and 227.53. A copy of the statutes may be found online or at your local library or courthouse.

Given under my hand at the City of Milwaukee,  
Wisconsin, this 2nd day of December, 2014

---

\sDebra Bursinger  
Administrative Law Judge  
Division of Hearings and Appeals

c: Office of the Inspector General - email  
Public Assistance Collection Unit - email  
Division of Health Care Access and Accountability - email  
Nadine Stankey - email



## **State of Wisconsin\DIVISION OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS**

Brian Hayes, Administrator  
Suite 201  
5005 University Avenue  
Madison, WI 53705-5400

Telephone: (608) 266-3096  
FAX: (608) 264-9885  
email: [DHAMail@wisconsin.gov](mailto:DHAMail@wisconsin.gov)  
Internet: <http://dha.state.wi.us>

The preceding decision was sent to the following parties on December 2, 2014.

Office of the Inspector General  
Public Assistance Collection Unit  
Division of Health Care Access and Accountability  
[NadineE.Stankey@wisconsin.gov](mailto:NadineE.Stankey@wisconsin.gov)